

From the desk of:

6/27/78

Warren C. de Brueys

To: James Adams, Associate Director, FBI

Jim,

I fully intended to make you a machine copy of the attached at the time I brought the original to the N.O. FBI Office, but failed to do so.

If you can garner enough time to read the summary of my testimony before the House Sub Committee on the Assassination of JFK, I would appreciate it; however, some of the pertinent problems that may emerge are set forth in the cover letter to the Director.

Hal Bassett responded and I received his letter at home last night, but have not had time to study it. Suffice it to say the Bureau could not authorize my review of the two or three reports I wrote in the N.O. Office in 1963 under the FPCC caption involving Oswald. I'll reply to Hal's letter when I get a chance to study it and business permits.

In the interim, do you feel an official request based on the following special circumstances would be honored. In short, mine is a request distinct from that of a citizen merely asking to see a Bureau report(s), for whatever reason. In my case, denial of a review of those two or three reports I wrote creates a serious inequity in that it precludes a right to answer the Committee's question as to the extent of my investigation not only to protect the Bureau's interest, but mine as well-- for without my recitation of pertinent circumstances and relevant data, accurate perspective by the Committee may be impossible. It simply broadens the base for

METROPOLITAN CRIME COMMISSION OF NEW ORLEANS, INC.

1107 First National Bank of Commerce Building

824-2148

ENCL. -2-

compounding the Committee's misunderstanding, which heightens the potential for faulty analysis and attendant erroneous conclusions, some of which I surmise may have already emerged in the minds of some Committee members.

The second approach, if the above is not persuasive enough, would be to request only summary statistical and analytical infor, ie, The FPCC case on Oswald in the N.O. Div'n. was opened on such and such a date and ruc'd on such and such a date. The For'n Agts. Reg Act Case or "IS-R" case by Milton R. Kaack in the N.O. Office (1963) was opened (date) and ruc'd (date). "I" number of Latin sources were contacted, "x" number of CPUSA infts. contacted, "I" neighbors and business people contacted; radio script obtained and forwarded Bureau; "Post Office" inquiry made, etc.

My main concern, although it would be completely erroneous, is that the Committee, lacking the depth of understanding of Bureau investigative techniques and administrative operations, as well as being completely oblivious to procedures demanded by Major Cases, will lose perspective and make indictments, although wholly without justification, which would scar the Bureau and mar its reputation irrevocably and in the process damage my reputation and that of other agents. It would matter little if their pronouncements could later be shown to be blatantly erroneous. What I'm trying to say, now is the time to act to pre-empt their potential for reaching such a faulty conclusion.

Best wishes,

W. C. de B.

Warren C. de B. Jr.
4827 Michoud Blvd
New Orleans, La. 70129